

**IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE  
EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING minutes**

**February 2, 2010**

**3:00-5:00 p.m.**

**107 Lab of Mechanics**

**Attendance**

Selby, M; Freeman, S; Palermo, G; Martin, M; Torrie, M; Walter, S; VanDerZanden, AM; Loy, D; Porter, M; Tanaka, P; Ford, C; Osweiler, G; Anderson, P; Wallace, R; Porter, S; Carlson, S; Hoffman, E (via Skype speakerphone); Holger, D; Owen, M; O'Reilly, P.

**I Call to Order 3:06pm**

**II Consent Agenda**

**A Agenda, Executive Board Meeting, February 2, 2010**

**B Minutes, Executive Board Meeting, January 12, 2010**

Agenda modified: add NTE policy 3.3.3.1. to old business; it will be postponed again to allow more time for more urgent issues. VanDerZanden moved to accept agenda as amended, Anderson seconded, motion carried.

**III Announcements and Remarks**

**B President-Elect**

Owen noted that a big turnover coming up in Senate council leadership, with 4 council chair terms expiring. Expressed concern about filling committee slots on Senate, and concerned about functionality of college caucuses. At 3:15 Hoffman was connected to the meeting (from pre-earthquake Chile) via Skype. Owen continued, commending the Governance Council subcommittee (chaired by Steve Porter), Carlson, and Tanaka for their work on proposed Handbook modifications and the MOU.

**C Provost**

Hoffman, speaking from the summery southern hemisphere, reiterated Owen's praise for the work done on the MOU. Carlson noted that some sticky issues remaining included 1. how to define a "good faith effort" to re-locate a faculty member whose position was terminated and 2. What constitutes a "program" for purposes of defining "program elimination". Hoffman asked what happens if the Senate disagrees with an administrative decision to eliminate a program, as the Handbook suggests that faculty has an approval right in deciding to eliminate a program.

**D Council/Caucus Chairs**

Wallace noted that LAS will discuss the MOU at its upcoming session. Loy noted that the Ag caucus soon meets with their Dean. Selby noted that Engineering caucus meets soon for discussion. Torrie noted that the Human Science caucus has held open forums on the matter, and currently are developing proposals. Osweiler, Anderson and Walter noted that Vet Med, Design and Business, respectively, were holding similar discussions.

**IV Old Business**

### **A Proposed Changes to FH Section 3.4 Nonrenewal or Termination of Appointment – Governance Council (Porter)**

Porter noted editing out the word “on” from the phrase “early termination on of [sic] term appointment”. Noted that the subcommittee meets three times in the current week and that the full Governance Council is slated to meet Friday afternoon. Proposed a vote on section 3.4 changes at the upcoming Senate meeting on 2/9/10. Hoped to have MOU finished for review by next week. Palermo noted that the MOU is flawed because it conflicts with the Handbook. Selby opined that the Senate should vote on 3.4 and the MOU together rather than separately; noted further that 3.4 very likely to be voted down as it is perceived as a permanent erosion of faculty rights. Carlson noted that there are three main issues/questions before us: 1. Is the EB OK with 3.4 modifications so they can be sent to the Senate; 2. What are procedures connected with the MOU, and 3. What exactly is IN the MOU in current form. She continued that the MOU is meant as a stopgap measure, featuring an expiration or “sunset” date, with the intent to make modifications to the Handbook when time permits. Steve Porter explained proposed changes to section 3.4, clarified that there are two types of appointment (term and continuous); clarified the extent of notice periods for termination.

At this point section 3.4 was beamed onto a screen for all to see. Carlson reiterated that we are clarifying what happens with a termination of a long-term appointment, in particular clarifying the period of notice required in all cases. Porter expressed concern that it’s pushing too hard to expect a Senate vote on section 3.4 in a week, because it could lead to a perception that the EB is a mouthpiece for the administration.

Freeman moved to forward proposed modifications of section 3.4 to the Senate. VanDerZanden seconded. Palermo noted that it is important to clearly show all the changes so that Senators would be clear on what they are voting for. Owen proposed that three things go forward to the Senate: A new “clean” version of the proposal, a copy of the prior version that was in “new business” for the previous Senate meeting, and a cover letter that made sense of it all. Motion as amended carried unanimously.

Concerning the MOU, Tanaka noted that we could deal with 3.4 now but make it contingent upon later approval of the MOU—have the Senate vote on 3.4 provisionally, to allay concerns about unknown aspects of the nascent MOU. Also noted that both could be voted on in March to allow more time for consideration at college level. Hoffman noted that the “ramming through” perception is problematic, such that delaying a vote until March may be best, but noted that March would be the latest because administration needs guidance for impending necessary actions. Tanaka noted that even March might be late for Deans attempting to make plans. Wondered whether the MOU could be finalized as “new business” for the 2/9/10 Senate meeting.

Porter then presented the MOU as a work in progress, describing its criteria and procedures in current form. Noted certain contentions, such as the question of whether 100% of salary moves with a transferred faculty member (a faculty preference) or some percentage (the administration’s preference). Noted that Handbook section 10.8 seems to indicate that faculty have a vote on program elimination. Proposed that Senate be granted a veto right over

program elimination, but that faculty approval not be necessary at college or program level, because faculty unlikely to commit hari-kari.

## **B Proposed Changes to FH Section 8.4.8 Open Meetings at ISU – Governance Council (Porter)**

(Discussion postponed)

## **VII Executive Session**

### **A Honorary Degree Nomination**

Out in the frozen landscape the Campanile tolled 4:45, and the sunlight angled low and dim through the south facing windows. A sense of restlessness permeated the room. Owen suggested we call for orders of the day to go into executive session for the purpose of considering honorary degrees. Anderson moved that EB go into executive session; Wallace seconded, motion carried. Following presentations by O'Reilly, Freeman moved to recommend approval for Brock. Wallace seconded, and the motion carried unanimously. Walter moved to recommend approval for Scheraga. Freeman seconded. Motion carried with a single "nay" vote. Freeman made a motion to come out of executive session; Anderson seconded, motion carried.

At 4:59, Walter moved to extend ten minutes. Freeman seconded, motion carried. Palermo noted that while the Senate is always advisory to administration as well as to the Regents on procedures and policies, he was concerned that the Handbook changes weaken faculty control over the curriculum. Much discussion ensued. At 5:10 Walter moved to extend another five minutes. Wallace seconded, motion carried. Owen proposed that we not include the MOU as new business, but that we do put it out for examination prior to the March Senate meeting. Holger reminded all that the MOU is a temporary measure. Torrie noted that the word "transfer" is a new term for the Handbook.

## **IV Old Business (cont'd)**

### **C Minor in Critical Studies in Design – (Hendrich)**

### **D ME in Information Assurance – (Hendrich)**

### **E ME in Civil, Construction, and Environmental Engineering – (Hendrich)**

### **F Event Management BS in Apparel, Educational Studies, and Hospitality Management – (Hendrich)**

### **G ME in Materials Science – (Hendrich)**

### **H Discontinue M.S. in Business – (Hendrich)**

Owen suggested we approve additional agenda items without discussion; suggested we change the order of agenda items so that discussion of Handbook and MOU come at the end of the Senate meeting. Asked that additional comments regarding 3.4 or the MOU be sent to Steve Porter by this evening (2/2/10), and that that he (Owen) would plan on introducing proposed 3.4 changes to the Senate as a provisional measure, contingent on later acceptance of the MOU (presumably at the March Senate meeting. Selby made a motion to so approve; Freeman seconded, motion carried.

## **V New Business**

None offered

**VI Good of the Order**

None offered

**VIII Adjourn**

At 5:18, Wallace moved to adjourn. Freeman seconded, motion carried.

**NEXT MEETING – TUESDAY, MARCH 2, 2010**

Minutes assiduously recorded, painstakingly typed and respectfully submitted by Michael David Martin, duly elected Recording Secretary of the Iowa State University Faculty Senate, upon this first day of March in the year MMX *Anno Domini*.